



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Die antike Kunstprosa, vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance, von EDUARD NORDEN. Leipzig (Teubner), 1898. 2 vols. Pp. xviii + 969.

It is the habit of those who look upon classical studies in America as having fallen hopelessly into detailed and fruitless minutiae, to deprecate the large and almost exclusive influence upon them of German scholarship. But would that these critics might be brought to acquaint themselves with the best and largest products of contemporary German scholarship and henceforth voice rather the wish that American classical philology might emulate the more that broad-horizoned and truly magnificent historical and literary philology, of which Germany has not lacked distinguished representatives from the days of its illustrious founders, the pupils of Fr. Aug. Wolf. In the development of every phase of the study of antiquity the University of Bonn has played a conspicuous rôle, and from the school of Welcker, Ritschl, and Jahn have come forth the masters who are still training us of the younger generation. The tradition in Bonn is a pervasive and vital one, as all have felt who have come into closer contact with teachers and pupils there, and out of it has proceeded this work by one of the younger members of the 'Bonn school,' to which, in the person of Professor Bücheler, it is dedicated.

Professor Norden entitles his work *Die antike Kunstprosa*, not professing to present a history of ancient prose, but using the term *Kunstprosa* in a somewhat sharply restricted sense of the prose which in one way or another looks beyond the mere communication of thought and aims to produce a calculated rhetorical effect upon the reader. It is the element of consciousness or calculation that would seem to be the distinguishing characteristic of *Kunstprosa*, so that, for example, an artificial simplicity or an affected naturalness (as in some phases of Atticism) would be ground for classifying a given work as *Kunstprosa* quite as much as the presence of every form of rhetorical artifice.

In the introduction Norden discusses some fundamental matters which conditioned the development of a rhetorical prose, and passes over in the first chapter to the features of prose style which passed in antiquity for the invention of Gorgias, the so-called Gorgianic figures. In regard to the first and most important of these, *antithesis*, it is to be interpreted as the conscious application to speech of the great antinomies of thought which the

philosophers of the VIth and Vth centuries B.C. were the first among occidental peoples to grasp and to formulate. When put in this large connection, as is well observed, we are able to look with more indulgence on those features of the style of Gorgias which seem to us so puerile. But though Gorgias was given credit for the invention of these figures, yet the pages of Herodotus and Euripides show that before him they had made their entrance into literature. In regard to these rhetorical figures as well as the use of poetical diction in prose, the term 'invention' can only mean for us that Gorgias brought to conscious application elements already in use. In addition to these 'inventions' of Gorgias still another element went to the production of rhetorical prose, the rhythmical period. The origin of this antiquity attributed to Thrasymachus of Chalcedon, who, like Gorgias in respect to the other elements named, may pass as the one who first reduced to rule a feeling common to all the Greek peoples and already employed by Sophron in the rhythmic prose of the mime.

The three elements thus considered—figures of speech, poetical color, the rhythmical period—became from this time essential postulates of artistic prose style, and the illustrations of the theory which Norden's comprehensive reading has here brought together, are of exceptional interest (p. 50 ff.). Language thus put together was akin to music, and it followed therefore that the voice must be employed in a manner intermediate between the tone of speech and song, accompanied by an harmonious and suitable movement of the body. The application of these principles as seen in the style of Gorgias is the subject of ch. III (p. 65), in which the rhythmic *κῶλα* of Gorgias are examined and the means by which they were produced. The conceits and paradoxes of thought, the natural concomitants of a style that aimed at effects so bizarre and unnatural, are also examined in this connection. The excesses of the master were surpassed by the pupils, and in them (Hippias, Alcidamas, Agathon) we can still from the meagre fragments discern that the distinction between prose and poetry was almost obliterated (cf. the parody of Agathon in *Sympos.* 194 E ff.). On the other hand, poetry learned the arts of the new rhetoric, and features of it which are discernible in Euripides reach their climax in the bombast of Agathon. The decline of tragedy was accelerated by the sophisticated rhetoric, and with the encroachment of poetical language and rhythms upon the domain of prose, poetry by degrees gave way to it; history took the place of the epos, the prose *parainesis* of gnomic poetry, the poetical encomium yielded to the prose *laudatio*, the *θρήνος* to the *λόγος ἐπινάφιος*.

The chapter following (p. 79) is devoted to a very interesting consideration of the theory of ancient historiography and its relation to rhetoric and to poetry, after which the masters of classical Attic prose are reviewed briefly, so far as they fall within the territory of *Kunstprosa*. Thucydides, whose style betrays a

curious struggle between individualism and the teachings of the new rhetoric; Xenophon, whose *naïveté* is in no small degree an artificial and calculated product, and Plato. Norden's discussion of Plato reveals more accurately than the foregoing the point of view from which he has undertaken to delineate the history of ancient prose style. For, while no one will doubt that Plato is one of the greatest masters of artistic prose, Norden's discussion is practically limited to the attitude of Plato toward certain of the refinements of the sophistical rhetoric. His treatment thus touches but a small part of what should constitute a study of the style of Plato, if indeed it does not leave untouched the real style of the man altogether. For about the person of Plato must be grouped many fundamental questions of stylistic history of much greater importance than his attitude toward the Gorgianic figures and poetical diction. In regard to Isocrates Norden presents in summary the characteristics of his style, emphasizing the fact that while he brought to perfection the artifices of Gorgias, he deprived them of their puerile excesses. His original contribution to style consisted in substituting for the short and verse-like *κῶλα* of his master, a full and rich prose rhythm and the periodic sentence. The remaining Attic orators are passed over with the briefest mention of Lysias and Demosthenes.

The period which follows is one of scanty record, but of extreme importance for the history of style, for it is the period of divergence between the extreme tendencies of Gorgias and Isocrates, and the reaction known as Atticism. It was, furthermore, the style of this period on which Roman prose was formed, and it also furnishes the key to the prose of the Greek Renaissance in the first and second centuries A. D. It is from this point on that the more original features of Norden's work appear, in tracing and distinguishing the outlines of stylistic history. Chapter five (p. 126) begins with a brief consideration of Demetrius of Phaleron: *hic primus inflexit orationem et eam mollem teneramque reddidit* (Brut. 36). But Demetrius was still an Attic orator and could not completely deprive Attic eloquence of its charm and dignity. The ornate and artificial style of Demetrius *e sophistarum fontibus defluxit in forum* (Brut. 96). But the beginning made by Demetrius culminated not on Attic soil, but in Asia. Of the two types of Asiatic eloquence distinguished by Cicero, that represented by Hegesias is best understood and stands in most intimate relationship with the sophistical rhetoric of the Vth century. The long periodic sentence of Isocrates and Demosthenes Hegesias broke up into short rhythmic *κῶλα*, in which, to produce the desired effect, he made free use of words superfluous to the thought (*quasi complementa numerorum*) and was quite regardless of normal word-order (cf. p. 136). In other respects too he reproduces the mannerisms of the early sophists and may be looked upon as their legitimate descendant. Of the second Asiatic style, characterized *non flumine solum orationis sed etiam exor-*

nato et facto genere verborum, and of which until lately no Greek monument has been known to exist, Norden recognizes a conspicuous example in the long and very perfect inscription of Antiochus of Commagene from the 1st century B. C. (published in 1890 by Hermann and Puchstein). In the history of style its importance is felt to be so great that it is reproduced entire, and in fact as a connecting link between the Attic prose of the IVth century and the Asianism which confronts us in early Latin prose, and in a modified form in Cicero, it is of great value.

As the culminating point of rhetorical artifice in the use of language it affords appropriate transition to the history of the reaction known as Atticism. This movement, called into life by the excesses of the Asiatic rhetoric in oratory and history, would seem to have begun about 200 B. C. It took its rise, we may believe, from the centers of the scholarly study of the past, Alexandria and Pergamon, where the study of the Attic orators led most naturally to an imitation of them. The question which has been discussed so actively of late years, whether the Atticistic reaction is to be looked upon as a Pergamene or an Alexandrine movement, Norden dismisses as a question incapable of solution with our present material, and as unessential to the further history of the movement. By the middle of the 1st century B. C. Atticism had in theory at least conquered, but Asianism was by no means driven from the field, although its representatives did not frankly profess their position and defend it, but claimed for themselves the true spirit of Attic style quite as vigorously as their opponents. In general the 'new style' with all its extravagances, as being an historical development, and as adapting itself to the tastes and tendencies of its public, possessed a sounder historical justification than the reactionary and artificial *μίμησις τῶν ἀρχαίων* of the Atticists. To trace this antithesis of the new and the old style through the subsequent history of ancient literature is the task which Norden pursues in the remainder of his work.

The period of Roman literature which antedates the introduction of Greek rhetorical studies lies in reality outside of the territory which Norden investigates. Cato here marks the transition, and in the fragments of his orations there is discernible a certain vacillation between the rough and inartistic language such as contemporary inscriptions reveal, and attempts at producing rhetorical effects such as Greek rhetoricians were then beginning to teach their Roman pupils (cf. p. 166). After Cato the development is more rapid, and is to be seen in the fragments of the younger contemporaries of Cato, and then most conspicuously in C. Gracchus. His master was an Asiatic rhetorician, whose theory of oratory was entirely congenial to the intense natural endowment of Gracchus. The fragments of his speeches reveal numerous examples of the extreme mannerisms of Asianism—carefully balanced *κόμματα*, antitheses, *ὁμοιοτέλευτα*, and rhythmic clauses. Evidence of the same rhetorical school is found in contemporaries

and successors of Gracchus, and notably in the puerile *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. In historical composition Caelius Antipater is the first conspicuous example of the new rhetoric, who for the sake of artificial rhythmic effects was notorious for complete disregard of natural word-order (cf. *ad Herennium* [ed. F. Marx], IV 18).

The classicism of the Ciceronian period (p. 181 ff.) is the result of the application of principles which have their origin in Greek theory. Careful selection of words (*elegantia*), rejection not only of all foreign words but also of older and harsher Latin forms (*urbanitas*), produced a finish of style that has perhaps never been equalled in the history of any other language. But it impoverished Latin unduly¹ and deprived it of many expressions of native picturesqueness and force. The grammatical controversy too of analogy and anomaly, in which the leading literary forces of Rome stood on the side of analogy from the middle of the II^d century, contributed to this impoverishment by the limitations placed upon the coinage of new words. In syntax, while the older freedom of construction was reduced to fixed norms, the same exclusiveness was not observed and the influence of Greek was admitted with much freedom, culminating for prose in Sallust and for poetry in Horace. Norden then passes in review (p. 194 ff.) the most important writers of the period: Varro, Sallust, and Nepos, as imperfect representatives of classicism; Caesar, Cicero, and Livy, as its norm and standard. The characterizations are brief, and in general admirable. The fullest treatment is naturally given to Cicero, whose admirers will be glad to find in these pages points of view for the consideration of his style, which have important bearing on the general estimate of his character. Norden's conception of the preliminary studies necessary to a just estimate of Cicero, as outlined on p. 214 ff., would seem perhaps a little discouraging after the centuries of devoted study which have been bestowed upon him. But I presume he is right, and his ideal is not a mere scientific registration of facts, but the recovery of points of view which shall assist us to understand and to feel Cicero as he was understood and felt by his contemporaries, and in a less degree by the Italian humanists: "for I confess," he says, "that I began to know Cicero best, from the time when I approached him through the mediation of the humanists."

The second main division of the first book begins with a general introduction on the new political and social environment of literature in the Roman Empire. Almost the only advance in literary art that can be discerned is the growth of individualism, with corresponding advance in the art of characterization and psychological analysis. The treatment of this relatively trite subject is made vivid by rich illustration and many original observations in detail. The two stylistic tendencies already observed

¹ Cf. Professor Shorey's Introduction to the Odes of Horace. Boston, 1898.

become still more pronounced in the imperial period, in Greek as well as in Latin—classicism, which was archaistic in tendency, and the new or modern style. The extreme representatives of the latter school display the rhetorical artifices of the early sophists, and of the Asianism derived from them. The more moderate ones avoid its extremes, but admit its claims in theory. The position of the saner representatives of the reactionary school of classicism is given by Quintilian (II 5, 21), in the injunction that one must not be *antiquitatis nimius admirator*, nor on the other hand *recentis huius lasciviae flosculis captus*. As between the two extremes the intrinsic justification of the modern school was greater than that of the Atticistic reaction, as corresponding more accurately to the character and the requirements of the time. Between the two extremes most men of sense took their stand, as Cicero had done in his day. Quintilian, while in sympathy and spirit a reactionary and a bitter enemy of the mannerisms of the new rhetoric, was still not blind to the excesses of his own partisans, as we have seen. In practice the extremes of Asianism are found in the treatment of declamatory themes which the elder Seneca has preserved for us in such tedious fullness. In form these declaimers affected an intensity of style in inverse proportion to the significance of their efforts. Brevity, point, elevation, finish and charm are the results at which they aim, but with a *κακοζήλῖα* which plunges them into all the corresponding defects. The careful characterization of this style, given on p. 263 ff., is one of the most valuable chapters of the book. The qualities which these rhetorical products display are the same as Cicero found to censure in the Asianism of his day. We therefore reach the result (p. 299) that in the historical development of ancient rhetorical prose, a continuous tradition may be discerned from the Vth century B. C. to the 1st and IIrd centuries A. D. The relation of the two stylistic theories to practice is then considered in a review of the principal authors of the silver Latinity. To select only the more important characterizations, the younger Seneca is the greatest and most typical representative of the new rhetoric. He was averse to imitation of the ancients and judged Cicero harshly; his nature was theatrical, and found a natural expression in the pointed and theatrical style of the declaimers. But his use of rhetoric is bold and conceived in large effects, and was a form of expression suited to an age of extravagant tendencies in good and bad—*ingenium amoenum et temporis eius auribus accommodatum*. In regard to Tacitus Norden is quite full, and what he presents is likely to meet with no little protest. The current conception of the genetic development of the style of Tacitus from the Dialogus to the Annals is rejected, and, with Leo, Norden believes that the Agricola, Germania, and Dialogus fall at nearly the same time and represent stylistic *tours de force* in different *genera dicendi*. His style at its culmination is a more highly developed form of the Sallustian *brevitas*, not with-

out large influence of the rhetorical and declamatory schools of his time (p. 342).

In the period which follows the archaistic tendency gains for a time the ascendancy, and, apart from the domain of stylistic theory, there emerges at this time a clearly defined romantic feeling of devotion to the past in all of its phases. It was a time of almost conscious recognition that the age of production was over and that it was time to gather up the heritage of the past for transmission to the future. But in the domain of literature the strife between the old and the new—between the style of conscious imitation of classical models, and the rhetoric of new inventions and new artifices for stimulating the jaded literary sense—continues. The difficulty of distinguishing between the two tendencies increases, however, for on the one hand the Asianism of the period sought for new effects in archaic words, while on the other some of the better representatives of Atticism (e. g. Arrian) reveal their theory less in painful reproduction of the vocabulary of the Attic masters than in the general *ῥῆσος* of their style. The interesting historical explanation of Roman archaism, which Wölfflin presented in his study of the Latinity of Minucius Felix, as the returning influence of the language of the provinces, and especially of Africa, where Plautus and Cato had remained the dominant authors, Norden (though he does not allude to it) would reject in favor of a conscious and learned archaistic movement, entirely analogous to the prevailing Atticism of contemporary Greek writers. Fronto, the most typical representative of archaism at Rome, was a personal friend of the Hyperatticists of his time; in his own use of Greek he is of the same school (cf. Naber, p. 242); he is opposed to the formation of new words, and, like contemporary Greek Atticists, he excerpted early Latin authors for archaic words and stimulated his pupils to the same activity.

For the new style the theoretical evidence is derived in larger degree from the abuse of the Atticists, but direct evidence is not lacking (p. 371). As in the Asianism of the III^d century B. C. so here it is possible to show that the new school was a conscious disciple of the rhetoric of the early sophists.

In practice, Norden distinguishes among the Atticists between the stricter and the more moderate followers of the dogma of imitation. To the latter class belong Plutarch, whose style is at its best in some of the ethical essays of the *Moralia*, Lucian, Arrian, Dio Cassius. Adherents of the stricter Atticism are rather the professional rhetoricians, Aristides and others. For the νεώτεροι Norden contents himself with giving specimens of their rhetoric, since, as he says, a characterization of their style would be only a repetition of the Asianism already described for the III^d century B. C. and the Ist century A. D. The volume concludes with a consideration of the stylistic position of some specimens of Greek literature which might not perhaps be looked for here; so especially the preface to the Pseudo-Xenoph. *Cynegetica* and the erotic Romances.

With volume two the literature of Christianity is taken up. Passing over the valuable introduction and the chapter on the literature of the New Testament, we may turn to the literature of Christianity which begins with the Apologists of the later part of the II^d century A. D. For the early church in general the New Testament stood as a protest against the pride of form and eloquence of the profane literatures, and in theory the majority of the Christian writers derived from the simplicity of their sacred books the principle that attention should be given only to the expression of thought, and diverted from care in regard to composition. But the literature that is preserved reveals that from an early time theory and practice were kept well asunder. In the gnostic heresy the complete assimilation of Greek form took place earliest, while in the orthodox church, as early as Clemens of Alexandria, we find a style as elaborated and as highly wrought as any product of the sophisticated prose of pagan rhetoricians (p. 549).

The influence of rhetoric on the Christian sermon culminates in the IVth century, when we find men like Johannes Chrysostom in the East and Augustine in the West complaining that their hearers come to them expecting much the same sort of entertainment as they would look for in the auditoriums of the declaimers. The form of the sermon developed on the lines of classical models, and on festival occasions corresponded to the panegyricus, while the ordinary sermon of instruction and exhortation was closely analogous to the Cynic diatribe (p. 556 and cf. p. 538). Of the three great preachers of the IVth century—Basil, Joh. Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nazianzus—Norden dwells longest on the last, of whom he has given a fascinating characterization (562 ff.). His style he designates in a word as a tempered Asianism and justifies this judgment in detail.

Returning to the field of later Roman literature, we find that the school of classical imitation has lost ground; for while in the ranks of the zealous protestants against Christianity (Macrobius and his circle) there was boundless devotion to the past, the stylistic tendencies of the present could not easily be escaped. The jurists, moving in a narrower tradition, are almost the only ones who succeeded in producing a style of classical purity, and of other writers Lactantius and Boethius were the only important representatives of the same effort. But for the whole period of the growing barbarism of the West, "the dogma of all stylistic barbarism was characteristic, that tattooing was essential to beauty" (Bernays).

The material for this period is arranged geographically, and accordingly Africa is taken up first. Here Norden's effort is to show first of all that there was, from a stylistic point of view, no such thing as a specific African Latinity, but that the qualities which, from the early Renaissance, have been looked upon as characteristic of a *tumor Africanus* are nothing more than a pro-

nounced manifestation of the artifices of the sophistical rhetoric. Florus and Apuleius, Minucius Felix and Tertullian are reviewed, and the characterization of the last-named author seems of exceptional interest (p. 606 ff.). From the sermon style of Cyprian and Augustine characteristic rhetorical artifices already observed, especially parallelism with *homoioтелеuton*, passed over into fixed characteristics of sermon literature.

As in the earlier period of the declining empire Africa holds the leading place in literature, so for the Vth and following centuries Gaul. The natural fondness of the Gauls for the refinements of speech (*argute loqui*), which Cato had observed and noted in his Origines, found in the sophistical rhetoric a welcome ally, and perhaps nowhere, not even in Africa, did the Asiatic tendency develop into more extravagant manifestations than here. The influence of Gaul was felt in Italy and contributed to the affected style of mannerism seen in Symmachus and Ammianus Marcellinus, Jerome and Ambrosius.

Limits of space which have already been far exceeded preclude a further following of Norden's argument through the Middle Ages and into the early Renaissance, although in many respects this is the portion of his work which makes the largest claim to original treatment. But passing over the valuable section on the antique in the Middle Ages, it must suffice to say that Norden continues the history of the two lines of stylistic tendency, traced through antiquity, down to the point where the Latinity of modern times ceased to be a thing cultivated for its own sake. For the English scholar the effort to prove that Euphuism is a direct product of the Isocratean studies of the humanists will be of interest, though doubtless others, with me, will question whether the problem is so simple. The work is concluded by two appendices, one on the history of rhyme, the second on the history of the rhythmic clause.

To pass authoritative judgment on the enormous piece of work which is presented in these two volumes must be the task of students of vastly wider reading and more intimate familiarity with the field covered than the present reviewer possesses, or ever hopes to possess.¹ In detail there is much to which exception may well be taken, as is inevitable in the treatment of a theme so dependent on subjective feeling as literary style. For myself I have felt this in numerous places, where my own studies gave me some right to an opinion. But it is our duty to look beyond the limits of our own garden-patch, and to modify frankly

¹ Since this was written, aside from a number of briefer notices, a comprehensive review by W. Schmid, the learned author of *Der Atticismus*, has appeared in the Berliner Phil. Wochenschrift, No. 8 (Feb. 25), 1899. Unfortunately, he permits the effect of some excellent criticism, combined with genuine recognition of the merits of Norden's work, to be marred by a disagreeable tone of carping querulousness.

opinions or feelings, if in the light of the whole they shall require it.

It is therefore with diffidence that I would venture the opinion that the book is open to the criticism of endeavoring to formulate stylistic history within the limits of too simple a scheme. The problems are, I fear, vastly more complex than one would gather from Norden's treatment. So, for example, I question whether the personal element, which we formulate in the dictum of Buffon—*le style est l'homme même*—can be so largely eliminated as is done by Norden (p. 11). There was to be sure, as he points out, the rhetorical theory which made style dependent on subject-matter, and independent of personality, but in practice is the theory confirmed in antiquity (for its applicability to Tacitus is far from certain), unless in the case of some trifling rhetorician, such as Apuleius, to whom no style was a vital expression of character, and whose facility of change had, I suspect, much the same ethical significance as the 'style' which in certain grades of society is 'put on.' One may question, too, whether the regular recurrence of typical vices of style in all periods justifies in all cases the inference of historical connection with a given source. But that the elements to which Norden gives predominate significance are present and of wide influence no one will deny in the face of the evidence which is here arrayed, and to have drawn these lines sharply through the whole history of ancient style is an Herculean service, for which the author may be confident of the gratitude of literary students throughout the world.

Jan. 15, 1899.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

Homère. Étude historique et critique. Par VICTOR TERRET, Professeur au petit séminaire d'Autun. Paris, Albert Fontemoing, 1899.

In a recent number of the Journal (A. J. P. XIX 346) I deprecated the premature introduction of the Homeric Question into the cycle of secondary studies. It can not fail to cool the ardor of the young student so readily kindled by the dramatic interest of Iliad and Odyssey; and to show how far I should be willing to go, I cited M. Victor Terret as an ensample to the flock. The *professeur au petit séminaire d'Autun* has read a great deal about Homer. The bibliography appended to his book takes up some 114 pages and covers the ground from 1795 to 1898. Being arranged chronologically and not topically, it is of the least conceivable practical value, even if the numerous misspellings did not breed distrust. Still, it is fair to suppose that the author has dipped into a large part of the works that he has cited in the text, if not all those he has cited in the bibliography. Into this stream of learning he stepped a unitarian. Out of it he stepped a